

Circuit Court for Prince George's County
Case No. CAD06-26267

UNREPORTED
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS
OF MARYLAND

No. 852

September Term, 2018

STARSHA SEWELL

v.

JOHN HOWARD

Friedman,
Beachley,
Moylan, Charles E., Jr.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: July 1, 2019

*This is an unreported opinion, and it may not be cited in any paper, brief, motion, or other document filed in this Court or any other Maryland Court as either precedent within the rule of stare decisis or as persuasive authority. Md. Rule 1-104.

Starsha Sewell, appellant, and John Howard, appellee, are the parents of two minor children. On July 29, 2014, the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County entered an order granting Mr. Howard sole legal and physical custody of the children; denying Ms. Sewell visitation; and ordering Ms. Sewell to pay child support. Thereafter, Ms. Sewell filed numerous motions to vacate the custody order pursuant to Maryland Rule 2-535(b), claiming that the circuit court had lacked jurisdiction to enter the custody order and that various parties involved in her case, including the judge, the Assistant State’s Attorney, the Prince George’s County Police Department, and the Department of Social Services had engaged in fraudulent or discriminatory activity. The circuit court denied those motions in January 2018. Ms. Sewell appealed, and we affirmed, holding that the circuit court had jurisdiction to enter the 2014 custody order and that Ms. Sewell had failed to demonstrate the existence of any fraud, mistake, or irregularity that would have warranted the court vacating that judgment. *See Sewell v. Howard*, No. 2266, Sept. 2017 (filed August 31, 2018).

After the mandate issued, Ms. Sewell continued to file motions to vacate the 2014 custody order and all directives issued by the court to enforce that order. Ms. Sewell now appeals the circuit court’s denial of three of those motions: (1) “Defendant’s Responsive Pleading & Motion to Stay, & Vacate All Orders Issued”; (2) “Supplemental Argument and Exhibits in Support of the Appellant’s Motion to Stay and Vacate the PG County Circuit Court Orders: On the Basis of Incorrect Venue, Extrinsic Fraud, and the Maryland Mortgage Task Force’s Breach of National Security as it Violated Executive Order 13519

and Executive Order 13722 and are ‘Insider Threats’ to the United States Economy”; and (3) “Maryland Rule 2-535(b) Motion to Vacate All Orders on the Basis of Irregularity.”

However, the claims that she raised in those motions, specifically that the circuit court lacked jurisdiction to enter the 2014 custody order and that various persons involved in her custody case have engaged in fraudulent or discriminatory activities, were raised in her prior motions to vacate. And we addressed those claims on appeal and held that they lacked merit. Consequently, the issues that Ms. Sewell now raises are barred by the law of the case doctrine. See *Baltimore County v. Baltimore County Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge No. 4*, 220 Md. App. 596, 659 (2014) (noting that “neither the questions decided [by the appellate courts] nor the ones that could have been raised and decided are available to be raised in a subsequent appeal” (citation omitted)).¹

**JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT
COURT FOR PRINCE GEORGE’S
COUNTY AFFIRMED. COSTS TO
BE PAID BY APPELLANT.**

¹ We note that, even if Ms. Sewell’s claims were not barred by the law of the case doctrine, we would affirm because none of the contentions raised in her motions to vacate establish fraud, mistake, or irregularity within the meaning of Rule 2-535(b).